TREATMENT OF ARCHITECTS.

SIR,—Allusion has often been made in THE BUILDER to the indignity that architects bring upon themselves and the profession, by entering into some such competitions as have of late been advertised, as a lure for the unwary beginners, who hope to make their name known, by trying for many of these things, no matter how little chance there may be of success or of adequate remuneration for their labours; but I think the following particulars, which I shall endeavour to state briefly, will shew that such are not the only indignities the profession has to put up with; and I am sorry to say it is not the only instance of similar treatment I have had practised on myself, though the only one I could bring home to the author of it, and by a man calling himself an architect!

Some little time back I received information from a friend in the north, that sundry designs of mine, which I had made for a gentleman in Ross-shire, had been submitted to another proprietor there by a man practising in Inverness, and with so studied a pretence of their being his productions, as will be inferred from their original titles and my name being entirely cut away. Having occasion shortly after to visit the neighbourhood of this town, in order to make sure of the identity of the drawings, I called at the office of this *soi-disant* architect; and having asked to see the designs made by him for the gentleman above alluded to, was, in his absence, shewn, without hesitation, by his clerk, my own drawings, mutilated as described. Having now satisfied myself of the truth of the statement, I put myself in communication with the said architect, through a solicitor; and as might be expected, had a correspondence opened, which was characterised by emphatic denials in the first instance, and apologies begrudgingly rendered at what he hoped was meant for the close of the scene. One small paragraph is worth quoting:—"I have never had an opportunity of applying any of your details, excepting some I have used in churches, and, I can assure you, that only sparingly, as they (the church builders, I presume) are but poor in this quarter."

I have but little to add: the person who owns this method so imposing is Mr. George Rhind, of Inverness; the gentleman imposed upon, Sir James McKenzie, of Seatwell; the gentleman for whom the designs were made, Duncan Davidson, Esq., of Tulloch Castle; and their author, your obedient servant,

GEO. FOWLER JONES.

Monkgate, York.

P.S. This is a strong reason in support of the argument why the "Institute" should have powers by virtue of a charter, not forgetting a fund, for the protection of the legitimate members of the profession against the abuses to which it is at present so notoriously exposed. I might, as an individual, have prosecuted in this instance, and perhaps obtained something more to the purpose than a shabby acknowledgement of the injustice done me,—but then think of the trouble, time, and cost!

G. F. J.

PUBLICATION OF THE VERNON GALLERY.—Mr. Vernon having specially presented to the proprietors of the *Art-Journal* the right to engrave the admirable collection munificently bestowed by him on the nation, the publication of these works, two each month, will be commenced in the ensuing number of that periodical, and will do much towards raising the reputation of the British school of art. In addition to their appearance in the journal, proofs of these engravings are to be issued as a separate work; and we have now before us impressions from eight of them, including Gainsborough's "Market Cart," engraved by Bentley; Uwins's "Little Brigand," by Lumb Stocks; Calcott's "Wooden Bridge," also by Bentley: and Stanfield's "Venice," by J. Cousin. In their first announcement the proprietors pledged themselves that the engravings should be worthy representatives of a gallery containing the choicest examples of the leading British painters of the era, and we have no hesitation in saying that they have fully redeemed their pledge. Those we have named are beautiful. We hope to find this work largely circulated.

CHICHESTER TRAINING-SCHOOL COMPETITION.

SIR,—There has appeared in your journal an advertisement from certain parties, asking for plans for the proposed Training-school at Chichester. On attentively reading it through, and pausing over the circumstance that even the drawings are to be sent free of expense, I cannot extract the slightest guarantee of premium or remuneration to the *fortunate* competitor, or indeed any expression which would prevent the committee from appropriating any of the drawings (so obtained) without the smallest remuneration to its author. Having, in curiosity, written to the secretary, more particularly on this point, and received an answer couched in rather ambiguous terms, I wrote again, requesting a further explanation. This communication having received a very uncourteous reply, which, moreover, strengthens my suspicion as to some shuffle being intended, I think it as well to call the attention of those who propose to waste time and paper in answering the advertisement to the dilemma in which they may be placed, more particularly as the *name of the party who will have the commission is already mentioned*.—J.

Sir,—As a sincere well-wisher to your very useful paper, I venture to express my regret at a paragraph respecting the Chichester New Training-school, which appeared in your last impression. Had you merely published the letter you speak of, I should have thought nothing of it,—it would have been taken for what it was worth (particularly if given with the name of the writer), and your readers would have been left to form their own opinions upon it; but an editorial notice is quite another thing; and I cannot think it wise that you should be so ready to make common cause with every angry correspondent, although he may be an architect, when (as in this case) you had confessedly no time to make the least inquiry into the circumstances. The party in question wrote to me a note which I am sure every gentleman of his profession would at once pronounce intolerable. I simply returned it to him without a single observation. And is this a reason why a paper like yours should lend itself to fasten a charge of dishonesty upon the whole of the Chichester committee? And can I ask less of you than that you should require to see the note which was sent to me, before you give further publicity to the charges made against us?

MATTHEW PARRINGTON.

Chichester, Dec. 4, 1848.

*** Our remark was founded on the terms of the advertisement, and depends in no degree on the note in question.

HYDRAULIC PRESSURE ENGINES.

AT a meeting of the Society of Arts, on the 29th ult., Mr. Brunel in the chair, a paper was read by Mr. Glynn, F.R.S., on "Hydraulic Pressure Engines," and the employment of high falls of water acting by their weight or pressure upon a piston working in a cylinder, to produce a reciprocating or alternating motion. It appeared that, in the year 1769, this subject had been brought before the Society of Arts by Mr. Smeaton, the engineer, whose construction of the Eddystone Lighthouse has since served as a guide in similar works. Mr. Smeaton had seen a column of water brought to bear by its pressure on the piston of a cylinder in a manner similar to the action of atmospheric pressure on the piston of steam-engines as they were made at that time, before Mr. Watt's improvements took place, the cylinders being then open at the top, and the piston forced downwards by the pressure of the atmosphere above. This ingenious application of water-pressure was the invention of Mr. Westgarth, a mechanic employed at the lead mines of Sir Walter Blacket, in the county of Northumberland.

Mr. Smeaton, with a desire to advance merit wherever it might be found, brought the subject before the Society of Arts, and obtained for the inventor a premium of fifty guineas; he also wrote a description of the engine, which was printed in the society's "Transactions." Owing to the great improvements subsequently made in the steam-engine by Mr. Watt, water-engines of all kinds were thrown into abeyance, and the water-pressure engine remained unemployed in England, until its use was revived by Mr. Trevithick, who was distinguished by the invention of locomotive engines to be used on railways, or rather upon the tramways of his time. Mr. Trevithick erected several water-pressure engines, and in 1804 he made one of them for a lead mine in Derbyshire, which is still working well in the Allport mines, near Bakewell. In 1841, the proprietors of the mines, by the advice of Mr. John Taylor, resolved to erect a very powerful engine of this kind to clear the mines from water: this was made by the Butterly Company, under Mr. Glynn's direction, and set to work early in the following year. It is one of the most powerful engines of this kind hitherto made: the work it performs is equal to 168 horse-power, and its useful effect was said to be equal to 70 per cent. of the theoretic power of the waterfall. The column of water in this instance is 132 feet high, the stroke of the piston is 10 feet, and the diameter of the cylinder is 50 inches; consequently, the pressure on the piston is equal to a weight of 50 tons. This engine is capable of making seven strokes per minute, without any concussion in the descending column.

A model of this engine is now in the museum of Economic Geology. The water-pressure engine, although neglected in England, has been extensively used in Germany, and drawings of some of the best German engines were exhibited to illustrate the paper.

PAYMENT FOR PARTY-WALLS UNDER BUILDINGS ACT.

CONFIRMATION OF OFFICIAL REFEREES' AWARD.

MR. NEWNHAM is the lessee of a house in Jermyn-street, of which the executors of a person named Finch are the legal owners. The property originally belonged to the Crown, and had been demised from time to time, the lessees covenanting to build the party-walls, and Mr. Newnham's lease contained a similar covenant. Some time ago a next-door neighbour gave Mr. Newnham notice under the Metropolitan Buildings Act that he was about to pull down the party-wall between their premises, upon which Mr. Newnham gave a similar notice to his neighbour on the other side, and the walls were pulled down and rebuilt, Mr. Newnham's share of the expenses being 1,500*l*. The Act provides that the expense shall be repaid by the beneficial owners of the property, and Mr. Newnham applied to Mr. Finch's executors to repay him the money; but as they refused to do so, application was made to the official referees named in the Act to arbitrate in the matter. The official referees decided against Mr. Newnham's claim, without hearing all the evidence he had to adduce of the expense he had been put to, on the ground that he was bound by the covenant in his lease to do what he had done, and had, therefore, no claim on the owners of the property.

In the Court of Queen's Bench, a few days ago, Mr. Whitehurst, Q.C., moved for a rule to set aside this award, chiefly on the ground that the party-walls Mr. Newnham had covenanted to build were only walls such as existed when the covenant was entered into, i.e., of lath and plaster, and not the solid brick walls which he had been obliged to build under the provisions of the Metropolitan Buildings Act.

The Court said, it was clear that the contract was to build such a party-wall as should be required by the law when the lessee was called on to perform his covenant, and they therefore refused to grant the rule.

LLANDILO-BRIDGE, CARMARTHENSHIRE.—This structure is completed. At the Carmarthenshire quarter sessions, Mr. E. Haycock, of Shrewsbury, the architect of the bridge, presented his report, from which it appeared that the bridge, which is the third largest in the kingdom, being nearly 150 feet span, is built principally of black marble, at an expense of about 18,000*l*., while Gloucester-bridge cost 60,000*l*., and Chester 40,000*l*.—*Eddowes's Journal*.

To learn about OCR and PDF Compression visit our website